

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application. Claims 1-26 are pending. Claims 8 and 16 have been amended. No claims have been cancelled or added. Therefore, claims 1-26 are now presented for examination.

Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102

Osten, et al

The Examiner rejected claims 1-26 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S Patent 6,735,660 of Osten, et al. (“Osten”).

Claim 1 of the present application reads as follows:

1. A method comprising:
requesting an InfiniBand connectivity configuration;
receiving a response regarding whether the requested configuration
can be provided; and
attempting to establish the requested connectivity configuration if
the response to the request is affirmative.

Among the elements in Claim 1 are “requesting an InfiniBand connectivity configuration” and “receiving a response regarding whether the requested configuration can be provided”. Further, Claim 8, as amended herein, provides for “receiving a connectivity configuration request associated with an InfiniBand connector, the configuration request representing an expanded InfiniBand connector configuration” and “providing a response to the connectivity configuration request indicating whether the requested expanded InfiniBand connector configuration can be provided”. Other claim elements regarding a request and a response are provided in independent claims 12, 16,

and 24. It is submitted that, among other differences, such elements are not provided in Osten.

Osten deals with communications operations that are referred to as “sideband” configurations. In Osten a primary connector obtains configuration information from an adapter and establishes configurations based on this information. Osten does not teach or suggest a process or apparatus that provides for a request for a configuration and a response to the configuration request. In essence, Osten describes a one-way process in which a host reads configuration information and acts upon the information, not a two-way communication in which a request is made and a response is received. Thus, the Osten system does not provide the same flexibility and choices that are possible with the invention described in the claims herein.

For example, the summary of Osten provides that an IOA (input/output adapter) may include “configuration logic capable of outputting the sideband configuration information for the IOA”, with a connecting apparatus including “control logic to receive the sideband configuration information from the IOA”. (Osten, col.3, lines 43-56) Further, Osten indicates that “IOA 26 also includes vital product data (VPD) defined in a VPD block 60, which provides, in addition to conventional VPD information, sideband configuration information that defines the sideband capabilities of the IOA”. Osten suggests other alternatives, such as using the make or model identifier for the IOA to provide access to a database containing configuration information or using other types of configuration logic to provide sideband configuration information. (Osten, col. 7, lines 43-57)

However, what Osten does not suggest is that an adapter provide a request for a configuration and receive a response for that request. Instead Osten describes a static adapter that either contains configuration information or is identified such that the configuration information can be received from another source.

For at least the above reasons, Osten does not anticipate the provisions of independent claims 1, 8, 12, 16, or 24. The remaining claims are dependent claims and thus are allowable as being dependent on the allowable base claims.

It is further submitted that Osten, as it does not teach or suggest any process or apparatus that includes a connectivity or configuration request and response, further clearly does not teach or suggest any process or apparatus for making such request and response. For example, claim 6 indicates that a request is “made through an Infiniband management link” and claim 7 indicates that “said request for a connectivity configuration is written to a first management link configuration register and said response to said request is written to a second management link configuration register”.

The Office Action cites to column 8, lines 8-34 and column 7, lines 16-34 and 43-53 of Osten with regard to these claims, but these provisions do not anticipate the claims. The Office Action indicates that the “VPD block on the IOA is equivalent to the first management link configuration register and the tri-state logic block is the second management link configuration register”, but this is simply an analogy, and not a correct analogy to the claims. First, management configuration links are provided in the InfiniBand specification and the devices described in Osten clearly are not equivalent. The relevant claims thus are not anticipated. Second, the operations of the devices described in Osten are very different from the claims. As is clear from Osten, no request

is written to a VPD block. This is a static element on the IOA that contains product data that is read by the host. The tri-state logic block in Osten does not write a response or have a response written to it. As described in Osten, the configuration information is simply read by the relevant logic. The operations described in Osten are thus very different from the elements of the claims herein.

For at least such reasons, claims 6 and 7 are not anticipated by Osten. It is submitted that the above arguments also apply at minimum to claims 12, 22, and 23 and that, for at least such reasons, these claims are not anticipated by Osten.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections have been overcome by the amendment and remark, and that the claims as amended are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the rejections be withdrawn and the claims as amended be allowed.

Invitation for a Telephone Interview

The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (503) 439-8778 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

Request for an Extension of Time

The Applicant respectfully petitions for a one-month extension of time to respond to the outstanding Office Action pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 (a). A check in the amount of \$110.00 is enclosed to cover the necessary fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(a) for such an extension.

Charge our Deposit Account

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 10/28/04



Mark C. Van Ness
Reg. No. 39,865

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
7th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026
(303) 740-1980